REMARKS

Claims 1, 5, 7 and 11-14 are pending in this application. By this Amendment, claims 1 and 7 are amended. Support for the newly recited features is found in the original specification, at least in Figs. 3 and 7, and associated disclosure. No new matter is added. Reconsideration of the rejection based on the above amendment and following remarks is respectfully requested.

Applicants appreciate the courtesies shown to Applicants' representative by Examiner Hayes in the March 11, 2004 personal interview. Applicants' separate record of the substance of the interview is incorporated into the following remarks.

Entry of the amendments is proper under 37 CFR §1.116 since the amendments: (a) place the application in condition for allowance (for the reasons discussed herein); (b) do not raise any new issue requiring further search and/or consideration (since the amendments amplify issues previously discussed throughout prosecution); (c) satisfy a requirement of form asserted in the previous Office Action; (d) do not present any additional claims without canceling a corresponding number of finally rejected claims; and (e) place the application in better form for appeal, should an appeal be necessary. The amendments are necessary and were not earlier presented because they are made in response to arguments raised in the final rejection. Entry of the amendments is thus respectfully requested.

I. The Claims Define Patentable Subject Matter

The Office Action rejects claims 1 and 5 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) over U.S. Patent No. 5,999,623 to Bowman et al. (hereinafter "Bowman") in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,069,957 to Richards (hereinafter "Richards") and U.S. Patent No. 5,727,065 to Dillon (hereinafter "Dillon"); rejects claims 7 and 11 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) over Bowman in view of Richards and Dillon, and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,226,618 to Downs et al. (hereinafter "Downs"); and rejects claims 12-14 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) over Bowman in

view of Richards, Dillon and Downs, and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,634,012 to Stefik et al. (hereinafter "Stefik"). The rejections are respectfully traversed.

As asserted by the Applicants' representative, and agreed to by Examiner Hayes at the March 11 personal interview, neither Bowman, Richards, Dillon nor Downs, individually or in combination, disclose or suggest encrypting and broadcasting contents together with a content related icon and summary information showing a summary of the encrypted contents to the plural end users, as recited in independent claim 1, and similarly set forth in independent claim 7. Further, as asserted by the Applicants' representative, and agreed to by Examiner Hayes at the March 11 personal interview, neither Bowman, Richards, Dillon nor Downs, individually or in combination, disclose or suggest selecting by the end user, by clicking on the icon and based on review by the end user of the summary information received, at least one of the encrypted content from the broadcasted contents that can be utilized by the end user, as recited in independent claim 1, and similarly set forth in independent claim 7.

Both Bowman and Richards pertain to methods and systems used in cable television broadcasts to automatically encrypt/decrypt information so that access is restricted or limited to only customers that have already selected (and paid) to receive cable television broadcasts.

Specifically, Bowman pertains to enabling an authorized receiver station to decrypt encrypted information broadcast by a transmitting station, for decrypting the information within the authorized receiver station (see Abstract of Bowman). Likewise, Richards pertains to an encryption system for restricted-access television systems in which multiple decryption keys are transmitted to customers as a hierarchy, the final decryption key ultimately automatically decrypting program material (see Abstract of Richards).

Neither Bowman nor Richards disclose or suggest encrypting and broadcasting contents together with a **content related icon**. Because Bowman and Richards fail to

disclose or suggest encrypting and broadcasting contents together with a content related icon and summary information showing a summary of the encrypted contents to the plural end users, Bowman and Richards cannot disclose or suggest selecting by the end user, by clicking on the icon and based on review by the end user of the summary information received, at least one of the encrypted content from the broadcasted contents that can be utilized by the end user, as recited in independent claim 1, and similarly set forth in independent claim 7. In fact, because the processes disclosed in Bowman and Richards are directed to automatically decrypting cable television broadcasts, Bowman and Richards teach away from allowing an end user to process any encrypted information by clicking on an icon.

Neither Dillon nor Downs or Stefik make up for the deficiencies of Bowman and Richards.

Dillon discloses an electronic document delivery system where a broadcast center periodically sends "a catalog" of available documents to a receiving computer, thereby allowing a user to browse through the available documents without having to access the broadcast center (see Abstract of Dillon). However, Dillon is silent regarding encrypting and broadcasting contents together with a content related icon, or the feature of selecting by the end user, by clicking on the icon and based on review by the end user of the summary information received, at least one of the encrypted content from the broadcasted contents that can be utilized by the end user, as recited in independent claim 1, and similarly set forth in independent claim 7. Further, Dillon does not disclose or even suggest generating a decoding key that decodes the encrypted content from actual decoding information accompanying the encrypted content and end user identifying information.

Downs discloses that the encrypted content and the decrypting key are sent separately (see Abstract of Downs). Therefore, Downs does not disclose or suggest generating a decoding key that decodes the encrypted content from actual decoding information

accompanying the encrypted content and end user identifying information. Further, Downs fails to disclose encrypting and broadcasting contents together with a content related icon, or the feature of selecting by the end user, by clicking on the icon and based on review by the end user of the summary information received, at least one of the encrypted content from the broadcasted contents that can be utilized by the end user, as recited in independent claim 1, and similarly set forth in independent claim 7.

Further, neither Bowman, Richards, Dillon or Downs, individually or in combination, disclose or suggest the list of information is displayed upon decoding of the encrypted content by the end user, as recited in independent claim 7. Dillon does not disclose this feature. Bowman discloses that a receiver station (A-D) may be authorized to decrypt as many encrypted sub-blocks of information (Sba-SBn) as are broadcast from the transmitter station 6 throughout the durations of particular ones of the time periods P1-Pn. However, Bowman makes no mention of the list of information is displayed upon decoding of the encrypted content by a user. Likewise, Downs makes no mention of this feature. Instead, Downs discloses that displayed information includes extracted metadata 173, for a music sample, the graphic images associated with a song and information describing the song, a preview clip of the song can also be listened to if included in the metadata SC. This information is displayed as a series of linked HTML pages in the browser window (of the user). See col. 73, lines 12-32.

Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit that independent claims 1 and 7 are patentable over the applied art. Claims 5 and 11-14, which depend from claims 1 and 7 respectively, also are patentable over the applied art for at least the reasons discussed above. Accordingly, withdrawal of the rejections under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) is respectfully requested.

II. Conclusion

In view of the foregoing, it is respectfully submitted that this application is in condition for allowance. Favorable reconsideration and prompt allowance of claims 1, 5, 7 and 11-14 are earnestly solicited.

Should the Examiner believe that anything further would be desirable in order to place this application in even better condition for allowance, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned at the telephone number set forth below.

Respectfully submitted,

James A. Oliff
Registration No. 27,075

George P. Simion
Registration No. 47,089

JAO:GPS/hs

Date: March 18, 2004

OLIFF & BERRIDGE, PLC
P.O. Box 19928
Alexandria, Virginia 22320
Telephone: (703) 836-6400

DEPOSIT ACCOUNT USE AUTHORIZATION
Please grant any extension necessary for entry;
Charge any fee due to our Deposit Account No. 15-0461